Remarks

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 19 have been amended. Claims 23-25 have been cancelled without prejudice. No claims have been added or withdrawn. Thus, claims 1-22 remain pending in the application.

Objection to the Specification

The title was objected to as not being sufficiently descriptive. The Applicant has amended the title to more clearly descriptive. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections § 112

Claims 6 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 6 and 19 have been amended to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections § 102

Claims 5-9, 11-13, 15-21, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0112808 filed by

Solomon (*Solomon*). Claims 23-24 have been cancelled without prejudice and, thus, the

rejection of claims 23-24 is moot. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9,

11-13, and 15-21 are not anticipated by *Solomon* for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP"), in § 2131, states:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the
> claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art
> reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2
> USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in
> as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor
> Co.*, 869 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Thus, under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a claim is anticipated *only if* each and every element of the

claim is found in the cited reference and the cited reference must show the invention in as

complete detail as contained in the claim.

Amended claim 1 recites:

> A method for describing a network comprising:
> programmatically categorizing a subnet into a subnet grouping based, at
> least in part, on whether the subnet is an internal subnet or an external subnet,
> wherein the internal subset is associated with a secure interface of a firewall and
> the external subnet is associated with a non-secure interface of a firewall, wherein
> subnets within a subnet grouping can route to one another;
> providing a subnet subsection for the subnet within the categorized subnet
> grouping; and
> specifying a network topology type section in the provided subnet
> subsection; and
> providing a network description, the network description including the
> subnet grouping.
> (Emphasis added.)

Amended claims 11 and 16 are, respectively, network and article claims that

similarly recite, "programmatically categorizing a subnet into a subnet grouping based, at

least in part, on whether the subnet is an internal subnet or an external subnet, wherein

the internal subset is associated with a secure interface of a firewall and the external

subnet is associated with a non-secure interface of a firewall … and … providing a

network description, the network description including the subnet grouping."

The Applicant respectfully notes that the cited passages of *Solomon* fail to

disclose that the categorization of the subset is performed programmatically. In addition,

the cited passages of *Solomon* do not disclose "categorizing a subnet into a subnet

grouping based, at least in part, on whether the subnet is an internal subnet or an external

subnet, wherein the internal subset is associated with a secure interface of a firewall and

the external subnet is associated with a non-secure interface of a firewall." The

Applicant further submits that the cited passages of *Solomon* do not disclose, "providing

a network description, the network description including the subnet grouping." For at

least the above stated reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 11, and

16 are patentable over *Solomon*.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-15 depend from claim 11. Claims

17-22 depend from claim 16. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the

limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 2-10, 12-15, and 17-22 are not anticipated by *Solomon*.

Claim Rejections § 103

Claims 2-4, 10, 14, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Solomon* in view of published U.S. Patent Application No.

2003/0106067 filed by Hoskins (*Hoskins*). Claim 25 has been cancelled without

prejudice and, thus, the rejection of claim 25 is moot. The Applicant respectfully submits

that claims 2-4, 10, 14, and 22 are patentable over *Solomon* in view of *Hoskins* for at least the reasons set forth below.

As shown above, *Solomon* fails to teach or suggest, "programmatically categorizing a subnet into a subnet grouping based, at least in part, on whether the subnet is an internal subnet or an external subnet, wherein the internal subset is associated with a secure interface of a firewall and the external subnet is associated with a non-secure interface of a firewall … and … providing a network description, the network description including the subnet grouping," as recited in claims 1, 11, and 16. *Hoskins* is cited as teaching that the subnet is to be supported by specific network standards. Whether or not *Hoskins* discloses the limitations cited by the Office action, it does not teach or suggest the above cited claim limitations of claims 1, 11, and 16. Because neither *Solomon* nor *Hoskins* teach or suggest the above-cited claim limitations, no combination of *Solomon* and *Hoskins* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 1, 11, and 16 are not rendered obvious by *Solomon* in view of *Hoskins*.

Claims 2-4 and 10 depend from claim 1. Claim 14 depends from claim 11. Claim 22 depends from claim 16. For at least the reason that dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 10, 14, and 22 are patentable over *Solomon* in view of *Hoskins*.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if

such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 18, 2008   /Philip A. Pedigo/
                                         Philip A. Pedigo
                                         Reg. No. 52,107
                                         Attorney for Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Tele – (503) 712-5560
Fax – (503) 264-1729